



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

claimed, of course, for the Bell Yard, because it is so close to the Tabard; but beyond its propinquity there is no evidence. It is possible, moreover, and even somewhat probable, that the (renovated) Bell in which Henslow lived "right over against the Clink" is the same Bell which before 1546 had been a disreputable stew-house. For Stow distinctly says that the stews were next to the Clink prison. To be sure, nothing in Stow implies that the Bell was the most easterly of the houses (although it is next to the last in his list); and the 1542 view of London by Wyngaerde shows a slight empty space between Winchester house and the stews. But it is at the least an odd coincidence that there should have been—if there were—two Bell's so close together in Stow's and Henslow's time.

The search has thus narrowed apparently to one (or two) inns of the late sixteenth century. But from 1593 to 1387 is a long leap—in the dark. We can say only that here on the Bankside had existed notorious brothels since before Chaucer's day, and among them there was a house known to Stow (who was born in 1525) as the Bell. To claim that since there was a Bell near the Clink in 1593 and also a brothel by that name somewhat earlier, therefore a century and a half or more earlier the Bell in Southwark was a famous resort for incontinent men and the like women, would be altogether unwarrantable. But if such *were* the fact, imagine the twinkle in Chaucer's eye when he wrote that

. . . assembled was this companye
At Southwerk, at this gentil hostelrye
That highte the Tabard, faste by the Belle.

The Knight, the Squire, Lady Eglantine, the Monk, and certain others would enjoy Harry Bailey's hospitality at the Tabard; the Cook, the Reeve, the Miller, and certain others may patronize the Bell also—it's not far away!

PAULL FRANKLIN BAUM.

Cambridge, Mass.

THE ORIGINAL END OF *Faerie Queene*, BOOK III

Criticism has traditionally seen in the first stanza of the Proem to Book IV of the *Faerie Queene* a reference to censure from Lord Burleigh:

The rugged forehead that with grave foresight
Welds kingdoms, causes, and affaires of state,
My looser rimes (I wote) doth sharply wite,
For praising love, as I have done of late,

¹ See for the stanzas Smith, J. C., *Faerie Queene*, Oxford, 1909, Books I-III, pp. 517-518.

And magnifying lovers dear debate;
 By which frail youth is oft to follie led,
 Through false allurement of that pleasing baite,
 That better were in virtues disciplined
 Then with vaine poemes weeds to have their fancies fed.

Burleigh's displeasure has sometimes ² been connected with the first writing of the *Hymn in Honor of Love*, printed in the 1596 edition of the *Fowre Hymnes*, with an apologetic dedication in which Spenser regrets the moral tenor of the first two.

P. W. Long, who dates the first Hymn at 1590,³ detecting there a possibility of sensuous interpretation to a reader ignorant of Platonic fashions, says of the reference under discussion: "The allusion refers to some poems regarded at some time between 1590-1596 as having been written 'of late.' To what other 'loose rimes' or 'vaine poemes' can the stanza refer?"

But *Faerie Queene*, Part I, Books I, II, III, 1590, has since Burleigh's time received a like criticism from perhaps less squeamish critics than Burleigh.⁴

The object of the present note is to suggest a special passage which might have come under Burleigh's attention,—the original ending of Book III, 1590, which described the rapturous reunion of Scudamour and Amoret.

At least here might be a more likely occasion for Burleigh's ire than a Platonic Hymn. We have long ceased to take seriously Spenser's repentance in the dedicatory epistle ⁵ to the *Hymns*. Dr. Long ⁶ points out in some passages a "feigning" for the sake of Neo-Platonic decorum, to suit the antithesis between the earlier and later *Hymns*. The literary retraction too has been recognized as a convention.⁷ At any rate, even if we could take Spenser at his word, it would be hard to recapture a really Puritanic point of view toward the *Hymn in Honor of Love*.

But the stanzas of *Faerie Queene* III, end, 1590, are frankly sensuous, boldly amorous, stanzas which must have been dear to the poet of the *Epithalamion*, not to be sacrificed without reason. Their excision has usually been explained as a necessity of structure.⁸ Spenser, returning to the *Faerie Queene* with the problem of Book IV before him, had further use for the separation of Scudamour and Amoret. He altered therefore the end of Book III,

² See Buck, P. O., *Mod. Lang. Ass. Pub.*, 23, p. 98.

³ *Englische Studien*, 47, pp. 197-208.

⁴ See for instance Jusserand, J. J., *A Literary History of the English People*, 2d ed., 1910, vol. II, p. 497.

⁵ Fletcher, J. W., *Mod. Lang. Ass. Pub.*, 26, 452.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 199.

⁷ Tatlock, *Mod. Lang. Ass. Pub.*, 28, p. 521.

⁸ For some statement of the discussion, see Erskine, J., *Mod. Lang. Ass. Pub.*, 30, p. 83.

that the lovers might just miss each other in the teasing way of romantic epic.

That Spenser did make a larger use of the Amoret theme than he had at first intended, seems obvious. He kept it at the expense of order and clarity, allowing the narrative to double on itself to introduce the Temple of Venus. He plainly needed Amoret. The excision, however, at the end of Book III was unnecessary in order to keep her. Amoret resumes her wanderings, only—after a romantic episode—to be lost again. She might as well have been lost by Scudamour as by Britomart, unless we can persuade ourselves that there is important allegorical need for her brief companionship just at this point with Britomart.⁹

More specifically, Spenser fails to introduce the rejected stanzas later when he has desperate need of them, toward the end of Book IV, after IV, 9, 39, perhaps.¹⁰ At last the several ways of Amoret and Scudamour draw together; there is again occasion for the rapturous greeting; but Scudamour entirely neglects to perceive Amoret. In this passage we have the worst loose end in the *Faerie Queene*, though Spenser had, ready made, the perfect finish. He must have had the fine stanzas in memory; certainly in print. But he failed to use them, careful man as he was in the salvage of old material.¹¹ Is it possible that he is still fearing of contemptuously obeying the frown of the "rugged brow"?

To the present guess there is of course the objection that the preface to Book IV may have been written so near the date of publication, 1596, that poems printed in 1590 could hardly have been called "of late." Burleigh's criticism would apply, however, as rightly to the *Faerie Queene* of 1590 as to a Platonic Hymn, of the same date if Dr. Long is right about the year, or earlier by other judgments.¹² It seems natural at least that Spenser, smarting from attack, and resentful at about this time for other reasons,¹³ began the second part of the *Faerie Queene* with this frank appeal against his enemy, and left it unchanged, as appropriate still in 1596.

ANNE K. TUELL.

Wellesley College.

⁹ *Op. cit.* Prof. Erskine includes the episode in his interpretation of the friendship allegory.

¹⁰ See Upton's comment, Todd, *Works of Edmund Spenser*, 1805, vol. v, p. 338.

¹¹ See for instance Sandison, H. E., *Pub. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, 25, p. 150.

¹² See Winstanley, L., Spenser's *Four Hymnes*, Cambridge, 1907, p. 11; Fletcher, J. B., *Mod. Lang. Ass. Pub.*, 26, p. 452. There is no evidence to show that Burleigh would have seen in manuscript the passage of the *Faerie Queene* under discussion. See Smith, J. C., *op. cit.*, pp. xi-xii.

¹³ See Long, P. W., *op. cit.*, p. 207.